T
T
copy 2

T T c2
Thompson, J. F.
Methods in Greek. --
R.W.B. JACKSON LIBRARY OISE THE
3 0005 01020 5170

THE LIBRARY

The Ontario Institute

for Studies in Education

Toronto, Canada

LIBRARY
JAN 13 1972
THE ONTARIO INSTITUTE
FOR STUDIES IN EDUCATION

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2008 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/methodsingreek00thomuoft

LIBRARY
THE ONTARIO INSTITUTE
FOR STUDIES IN EDUCATION
TORONTO, CANADA

T
T

JAN 31 1968

Lft
copy 2

EXAMINERS' CERTIFICATE.

The Registrar,
University of Toronto:

We beg to report that the thesis of Mr. J. F. Thompson, together with his discussion of the questions set in Philosophy and Ethics, and in the Science and Art of Education, qualify him for the degree of Doctor of Pedagogy with second-class honours.

(Signed) J. G. HUME
F. W. MERCHANT
F. TRACY

June 4th, 1906.

METHODS IN GREEK.

In connection with the above title some apprehension may be pardoned lest the pedagogical value of any efforts having as their object the securing of better results from the teaching of Greek should be seriously called in question; especially so if those efforts should be suspected of having, as a further object, the popularizing of a study which many regard as yielding results altogether disproportionate to the energy expended in mastering its subject-matter. The present writer has no desire to invite criticism on this score; it is not as a propagandist or even an apologist of classical studies that he now takes his pen in hand. Since undergraduate days, his own intellectual pabulum has been too largely drawn from materials furnished by the mathematical and natural sciences (especially Astronomy and its ministering subjects) for him to doubt their transcendent value both from a formal and a utilitarian standpoint. For developing the power of inductive reasoning—the most valuable intellectual gift which an ideal education can bestow upon man—they have no equals. Their application to the different purposes of trade and commerce is so manifold, so indispensible, that it is cheerfully conceded that they must forever remain the chief instrument of an enlightened educational system. But while all this is undoubtedly true, still there is a strong likelihood that a certain proportion, however small, of the product of such a system, will continue to be scholars trained in the language, the literature and philosophy of ancient Greece. It is even desirable that such should be the case. The probability is surely strong enough to justify some labor in this small corner of the educational vineyard; the desirability will be duly considered before proceeding to a detailed explication of the objects of this paper.

Treating a certain negative phase of the subject first, it may be urged that no one should ever enter upon the study of a language which one does not intend to follow to a definite conclusion, that is, until one is able to read and write it with tolerable ease. The advantages of language study are not reaped in any great degree until after the intelligent mastery of a language. Of course some disciplinary value may attach itself to the initial

and intermediate stages of language study, if the subject-matter is properly presented; but hardly to such an extent as to justify the expenditure in such a way, of time which might be devoted to other studies of equal or greater disciplinary value, and with which there is associated a more pronounced and immediate utility. And again, under a system like our own, where knowledge of the elements of a language is tested by a written public examination, the subject-matter is hardly ever properly presented. The temptation is very strong for the teacher to see that his pupils have a knowledge, more or less temporary, of the required elements for the required occasion, without troubling himself too much with the way that knowledge is acquired, since the latter point is not, as a rule, brought into evidence by the ordinary written examination. Therefore the point is here strongly urged that those only should embark on the study of a language, who have the time and inclination to proceed to its intelligent mastery.

Among the advantages which one who had thus made the language, in a sense, his own, would reap, possibly the most obvious, if not the most important, would be what might be called the *verbal* advantage. For the purposes of technical, scientific, or philosophical study, the Greek had in one respect a certain advantage over an English-speaking person of to-day. The former's language, while copious, was not composite, and readily lent itself to the expression of any conceivable idea. But all the ninety thousand Greek words, whose accentuation was determined by the Alexandrian grammarians, were built up, by a process of derivation and composition, from a comparatively few root words, which latter would form the vocabulary of common things, the vocabulary of childhood. Now every one knows how much more of strength and vividness inheres in the common words, acquired in infancy, than in the more complex terms acquired in later life. The word, "strength," for example, is for us a word full of life and vigor, the term, "calisthenics," which we may not hear until adult life, is merely a symbol, like x—to which a certain meaning must be attached; none of the products of our primitive experience are present to suggest, strengthen, or emphasize the meaning of the new word. To the Greek, however, its meaning is, in all its fulness, reinforced by legions of primitive associations. With its component words, καλός and σθένος, he has been familiar from childhood; and their meanings now merge together in a new product, which retains the strength and vividness of its originals. Practically no scientific or philosophical term existed or could

exist in his language which would not, on its first hearing, convey its own meaning to the most illiterate citizen of Athens. To an Englishman, however, the study of a new science presents not only the difficulties inherent in its subject-matter, but also those connected with the mastery of a new language. The terms used are for the most part, to him, uncouth and meaningless, and his first care must be to familiarize himself with an immense vocabulary. During the times immediately succeeding the renaissance, the study of Latin was urged on practical grounds, as all knowledge of any value was then locked up in that language. It might be said, with at any rate an approximation to the truth, that the magnificent results of modern scientific investigation are, if not locked up in the Greek language, at least concealed beneath its vocabulary.

It is not contended for a moment that the above constitutes any valid reason why the study of Greek should precede the study of natural science. The scientist, in a sense, does learn Greek; but he learns it as he requires it, and in the process disregards these portions of the language not essential to his purposes. His labor in this connection is consequently immensely less than would be the case, were he to make a formal study of the language a preliminary to a course in science. While no one would be justified in learning Greek merely on account of its connection with modern scientific terminology, still it is here urged that one who has for other purposes already acquired the language, has in this respect an incidental advantage not shared by the non-classical reader, who has not received a special scientific training. As the Greek scholar is familiar with the words entering into scientific terms in their sentence connection, they appeal to him with a freshness and vigor of meaning, which no English dictionary can lend them.

It is quite true that the validity of the above argument has been challenged by very formidable authorities. But it seems to the writer that Professor Bain in his admirable work, "Education as a Science," has scarcely treated this phase of his subject with his accustomed fairness. It is quite true, as he asserts, that a Latin word has seldom the same meaning that its English derivative has. But he omits to state that it has a *related* meaning; its meaning, though not *the same,* is always *similar* to that of its English derivative. And with this caution in mind the learner will be almost as much benefited by the similarity of meaning, as he would by its absolute identity. The Latin word "accipio," means not "I accept," but, "I receive." The relation, however, is obvious. Professor Bain's argument would be a fair one, in

this connection, only if the meaning of "accipio" were absolutely unrelated to that of the English word "accept." With regard to scientific terms derived from the Greek he urges the objection that there is often ambiguity involved if the literal meaning of the Greek original is our guide. This would apply to the majority of English words as well, if taken apart from their context. If, apart from its setting, we examine the word "barometer," we might imagine that it referred to some kind of scales; but seeing it in a sentence-connection, we should hardly be likely to assign it a wrong meaning. One may grant that a Greek scholar would be more inclined to connect "aneurism" with ἀ᾽ηερος than with ἀνευρίνω but the meaning in the former case would not be justified by the context. When the English word "aneurism" was first coined, it would have been spelt aneurysm (from ἀνευρίνω, through ἀνευρυσμός, as cataclysm, from καταλύζω, through καταλυσμος), had proper linguistic precautions been taken. But in any event the meaning is not hard to trace. And the principle of contrast would be as effective as that of similarity in vivifying its meaning. In those few cases where the literal meaning of the word would be misleading, as in "Methodist," "eudiometer," it may be pointed out that the literal meaning was not misleading when the English word first appeared. In every case such meaning is significant of interesting attendant circumstances connected with the first introduction of the word.

But the more positive advantages which accrue to a Greek scholar, and the only ones which would justify any educational system in attempting to produce Greek scholars, in however limited numbers, are those derived from the literary value of the fully-mastered language. And here one might attempt to correct the impression, which to a certain extent prevails, that translations of the Greek classics are able to convey, approximately enough, this literary value, in so far as any such exists: A short time ago the present writer dictated to a high school class a prose paraphrase (with which some pains had been taken), of a portion of the first Canto of Scott's "Lay of the Last Minstrel." Though the poem referred to had been quite recently read to the class, no one recognized the story in its altered form. The original was then read to the class, and the members were invited to point out any difference in meaning between the story as told in prose, and the story as told in verse. No difference whatever was discernible. Yet the difference in effect was exceedingly marked. The prose version made very insipid reading, while the original was grand and magnificent. The class was then asked to symbolize

the bare meaning by the character a. They then decided that the prose version could be accurately symbolized by the character a alone, as it contained the bare meaning and nothing more. The poetical version also contained the bare meaning, and something more, which was symbolized by x. So $a + x$ would represent the original poem. Now $a + x$ was grand and inspiring; and the class was then directed to a consideration of $a - x$. $x = a$, the prose version. This was decidedly insipid. The class was then invited to consider the relative merits of $a - x$ and of a. It was decided that $a + x$ was very many times more valuable than a, consequently that x was many times more valuable than a. This x they now decided to call "literary effect," which therefore, in their opinion, was many times more valuable than the bare meaning. And who will say that they were wrong?

But literary effect, which in literature, as distinct from textbooks and scientific and technical works, is so much more valuable than the bare meaning, is something which is the effect of many causes. It is influenced by the linguistic and historical associations of the words used (compare "horse" and "steed") by the varied relations of the different words in the same sentence—by the relation between the words used and the theme on which they are employed. The same words may be made to yield a vastly different literary effect by a slight change in the order of their arrangement in a sentence. "Diana of the Ephesians is Great," hardly appears as the same sentiment, in the form, "Great is Diana of the Ephesians." It may be said that each literary production has a literary effect of its own, which any paraphrase, any change of form, any change even in the word-order will destroy, or greatly modify. When such is the effect of paraphrase, what must be the effect of a translation? This effect is especially enhanced when the translation is from a synthetic to an analytic language; and most especially when from a synthetic language with a copious vocabulary, and developing the most subtle distinction in both word-meaning and sentence-meaning, to an analytic language with a limited vocabulary, and comparatively indifferent to refined linguistic distinctions. The most a translation can accomplish is to give the bare meaning; the literary effect must be completely lost. It is not denied that a translation has literary effect, and may have literary value. But it is the literary effect of the translation, and having its origin in the translator. It is *not* the literary effect of the original, nor does it in any way reflect the literary genius of the author. To read Homer, one must master Greek. Pope's "Iliad" is not Homer's "Iliad"; nor is Jowett's "Republic," the "Republic" of Plato.

Now the literary value of any language, of any literary production, is something which cannot be demonstrated; it must be felt. The relative literary value of Greek and of any other tongue may be stated; but the statement can be supported by indirect evidence alone. The evidence of English men of letters, who are familiar with both English and Greek, is practically unanimous in favor of the great literary superiority of Greek. The evidence of literary men of other nationalities, who understand both their own language and the ancient tongue of Greece, is practically unanimous in favor of the literary superiority of the latter. Their testimony has greater weight from the fact that their necessarily greater familiarity with their native tongue must enable them to appreciate more fully its literary value; and their estimate of the literary value of a foreign tongue, however carefully mastered, must always be an under rather than an over-estimate. In this connection it is hardly necessary to state that an estimate of the comparative literary value of two languages is worthless, unless coming from one who is a fair master of each, and that a bias in favor of the language with which the critic is more familiar must be expected, a bias which should be directly proportioned to the difference of degree of familiarity. To the above consideration must be added the undoubted fact that Greek literature has most powerfully influenced all modern literature. The connection between the literature of Greece and that of any modern European nation is more intimate and direct than any connection between the respective literatures of any two modern nations. The unifying nexus of all that is greatest and most enduring in modern literature is found in the literature of ancient Greece. The temptation is very strong to dwell upon this point, and to marshal the host of evidence which may be adduced in its support, but as the last argument is seldom disputed, space may advantageously be economized by allowing the unsupported statement to stand.

The political atmosphere of Athens, to which the Greek scholar is introduced through the pages of the Attic historians and orators, cannot but make its bracing qualities felt in furthering the political development of the modern citizen. The vigorous character of the Athenian democracy has never been fully realized either in mediæval or in modern times. Very rarely has Athens, either in a literary or political sense, been studied at first hand. The city and its institutions have been viewed by us through Roman spectacles. The description given of the Attic political life, even by those who are presumably authorities on the subject, is invariably tinctured by an intermixture of Spartan and Roman

ideas, and the modern world has failed to comprehend the political thought of those, who were, politically, the wisest of peoples. Our modern political world is Roman. The Roman Empire never perished. Its outward form alone was changed. Nearly every modern political principle which obtains in the great European and American nations, originated and developed in the city on the banks of the Tiber. How different the political conceptions of the Athenians! How strange to us seems their idea that the world's great men in politics and war are and have been the scourges of the world! That they are monsters of egotism, and that their production is to be discouraged! That the really great men whose existence is a boon to the community are those who devote their lives to the furtherance of literature, science and art! For the successful general the Athenians had chains (witness Miltiades). For the ambitious statesman, exile (witness Themistocles—Cimon—Aristides); on the other hand, their great poets and philosophers they crowned, and placed in the highest seat of honor. In the modern Roman empire (*i.e.*, the realms of the great powers) the successful general and the ambitious statesman, whose restless and boundless egotism may have disturbed a continent's peace and ruined the happiness of millions, dwell in palaces, while their men of literature may be found in attics. How strange, again, the Athenians' idea that rulers and intellects, mighty with the instinct of governing, were not needed; that their parliament (the bule) was not to be their ruler, but merely their adviser—that the people should in fact as well as in theory govern themselves, make their own laws, instead of intrusting that power to so-called representatives! Whether right or wrong, Athenian political economy was the antithesis of the Roman, which is ours. And the Greek scholar has the advantage of viewing sharply contrasted systems.

Again in matters intellectual, the Greek spirit was essentially a free spirit, an enquiring spirit. Considering the position from which they started, the progress made by the Greeks in science and philosophy was wonderful. Here again there is popular misconception with regard to Greek scientific attainments. The superstition of Rome, and the ignorance of the middle ages have been erroneously imputed to a people who valued the search for the truth, the freedom of intellectual investigation, as the very breath of life. The system of astronomy, which we know as the Copernican, was first elaborated by the Greek philosopher, Pythagoras; and when first discussed in medieval times was known as the Pythagorean system. Centuries before the Christian

era Aristarchus of Samos applied geometrical principles to the determination of the sun's distance from the earth in terms of the moon's distance. His theory was correct, though imperfect instruments rendered his results valueless. Greek attainments in geometry are well known. The accident of the Roman conquest quenched the spirit of free investigation amongst the Greeks and retarded the progress of the human race by fifteen centuries. Essentially Greek is the modern spirit of scientific investigation. The spirit which stands for the untrammelled freedom of the human intellect still breathes in the clear atmosphere of Athenian literature, and cannot but affect its votaries.

Although the absolute progress made by the Greeks in the physical and natural sciences was, owing to lack of time, insignificant, the same cannot be said with regard to the mental and moral sciences, in which the Greeks made solid progress. Here again the reputation of the Greeks' intellect has suffered through the bondage in which the philosophy of Aristotle is supposed to have held European thought during so many centuries. The prevalent philosophy of those times, however, was not the philosophy of Aristotle, but that of the scholastics, and imputed by them to him. Scarcely any of the scholastic philosophers had read or could read Aristotle in the original. Here again the world has judged the Greeks, not by what it knows of them at first hand, but by what others have reported about them.

Again it may be urged that in this respect good translations would do for us all that the originals can do, where matter of fact alone is concerned. So far as the natural and mathematical sciences are involved, the point is freely conceded. Euclid's elements may be as advantageously studied in an English translation as in the Greek original, even by one who is equally familiar with both languages. But in political economy and philosophy it is different. The literary effect, the spirit of the original, is necessary here to arouse the attention and chain the interest of the reader. The great languages of modern Europe have essentially the same structure; and in translating from one to the other, it is not so difficult to reproduce some portion at least of the literary effect and of the spirit which animated the author. In translating from Greek into a modern tongue this is next to impossible. Kant and Herbart do not suffer in translation, as Plato and Aristotle do.

Then as to what may be called the general aesthetic effect of Greek literature, we must never forget that Greek was a language spoken when the world was young and full of the vigor of youth,

a vigor which Greek literature fully reflects; while in the writings of to-day are reflected the hopelessness and despondency of old age: to the former we turn as an aged man to the records of his long-past youth, to renew, if but for a brief time, the brightness and vivacity of early days.

The argument that Greek should be studied by some, since it is the language in which the New Testament was first written and into which the Old Testament was first translated, is mentioned here mainly to notice a criticism of Professor Bain's in this connection. All that is necessary, he maintains, for the purposes of biblical study, is that the student know New Testament Greek, disregarding completely what is known as classical Greek. This, coming from the originator of the differential theory of presentations, must surely be the expression of prejudice and not conviction! Let the theory which Dr. Bain has himself originated be applied here: "What we are conscious of in presentation—even in the simplest materials of knowledge—is not so much the presentation itself as the difference between it and other presentations." To have read one book in Greek does not by any means qualify a student to pose as a critic even of that book. Before his criticism can be valuable he must be a thorough master of the language in which the book is written. He must have general apperceptive centres already formed to which the different points in connection with a particular work may be referred. Much of what passes as biblical criticism is absolutely worthless because its authors lack that intelligent knowledge of the Greek language which should form a basis for the construction of a critical judgment. It may be here observed that even in Old Testament exegesis the Greek of the septuagint is more valuable than the Hebrew. For the literature of the latter language is so meagre that we lack that power of relation, which is so essential for the critical interpretation of a text. With the Greek translation the case is different. The Hebrew we know, and must always continue to know, but imperfectly. With the Greek we may become thoroughly acquainted. So the Greek septuagint version is more valuable than the Hebrew text, as the former is necessary to the correct understanding of the latter.

Language is necessary as an implement of thought. Without language intellectual activity, except in its simplest forms, is impossible. The genesis of language in the history of the human race undoubtedly was due to the felt necessity of thought. Mental activity expressed itself in language; the latter is the result of the former. But it is hard to imagine action without correspond-

ing reaction; and so while increased clearness of mental vision results in the further refining and perfecting of its vehicle, language, it is surely a warranted inference that the refining and perfecting of language tends to increase and render more effective the different forms of mental activity. The particular direction in which this re-action manifests itself may possibly be to lessen a particular failing to which the mind is naturally prone in connection with the process of inductive reasoning. The failing alluded to is the following: Generalization is a more natural process than differentiation. The child recognizes the genus before the species. To the newly-born babe the entire external world is one undifferentiated continuum—all things are alike. Mental activity is marked by the process of differentiation, but to this process the mind offers a certain resistance. Its tendency is to ignore differences. Now in inductive reasoning the tendency of the mind is to dwell with a certain impatience upon particulars, and to pass as quickly as possible to the general conclusion. The great weakness in all human thought is that we generalize upon insufficient data. We do not observe enough particular instances, nor are we sufficiently on the look-out for points of difference in the particular instances themselves, to justify the general conclusions which are often formed. The writer's belief that linguistic study properly pursued tends to check this general tendency is based upon experiments conducted by himself upon classical high-school pupils, with regard to their power of forming correct conclusions from certain data. He realizes that the theory may itself be but an instance of that tendency to hasty generalization which he condemns. It should not, therefore, be styled either belief or theory; but is hesitatingly put forward as a thought which might justify further and more extended experiments.

Now, should this interaction between thought and language actually exist, as does not seem improbable, it might be held to follow that the more perfect the language the greater its value in this very connection. Now whether considered with regard to the extent and structure of its vocabulary, or the richness of its inflectional system, Greek is the most perfect instrument of human thought that exists or has existed. The differences between it and the principal modern languages are so marked that a student, in learning Greek, must readjust all his previous ideas with respect to language. As compared with the Hellenic tongue, a modern European language differs little from our own. The effect of learning such is little more than to increase our vocabulary. The learning of Greek, on the other hand, enlarges our linguistic

horizon in all directions. The value of a language as an instrument of thought may be roughly stated to be in inverse proportion to the number of words needed in the expression of ideas (as compared, of course, with other languages), and in direct proportion to its facilities for expressing delicate shades of thought. In the former respect Greek supremacy is conceded. We all know that in translating from Greek into English, to express the different shades of meaning is so difficult that as a rule it is not attempted. And the ordinary English rendering of a Greek text contains, generally speaking, merely an approximation to the meaning of the original. With regard to this last point, a description of the many facilities possessed by the language to express minute differences in meaning, would require a special treatise. We might, however, notice in passing the following striking facts: Upwards of ninety thousand Greek words were enumerated by the Alexandrian grammarians. Considering the synthetic character of the language, this total would be multiplied many times as measured by analytic standards (the verb, *e.g.*, contains hundreds of forms, and ἐλελύμη might justly be classed as a separate word from λύω), while English, possibly the richest of all great modern languages, does not contain more than fifteen thousand. Some one may object that an English dictionary contains from 100,000 to 300,000 words. The English dictionary may, but the English language does not. That is, if we mean by the English language, the language spoken and understood by the vast majority of English-speaking people. Of dictionary words by far the greater number consist of scientific, technical, or obsolete terms, understood in their entirety by no one. The dictionary contains, not one language, but many, the technical and scientific terms being understood only by those few whose business it is to understand them. But the vocabulary of English literature, of the ordinary educated Englishman, who is not a specialist in some branch of knowledge, is easily contained within the fifteen thousand limit. But, as has been pointed out before, no section of the Greek vocabulary had a sealed meaning for even the illiterate Greek. The conclusion, then, that we may be justified in drawing, surely is that if language reacts in any way so as to produce a greater capacity for abstract thinking, then no language can equal the Greek in this regard.

In what has so far been urged, the writer wishes to avoid the appearance of attempting to prove too much. It is not claimed that it is either necessary or desirable that the great majority of our educated men should be acquainted with the Greek language. No attempt has here been made to assign the subject a higher rela-

tive position than should be assigned any other study or group of studies. It has merely been held that the time and trouble, which are necessary for the acquisition of the language, are not disproportionate to the mental benefits which accrue from that acquisition. When to this is added the fact that, if for no other than traditional or sentimental reasons, an influential section of the community will always insist on some provision being made in our curricula for the study of Greek, we may regard it as highly probable that some portion of our educational energy will continue to be expended in producing a certain (possibly small) number of Greek scholars. And, therefore, that any effort having as its object the improvement of the prevalent methods in the teaching of Greek is not necessarily devoid of pedagogical value.

But it has not been merely to secure pedagogical respect for the object of the present effort, that the question of absolute intrinsic value in connection with the study has been treated at such length. A further object has been to direct attention to a certain feature of our subject-matter, which should be carefully discussed and intelligently understood. Nearly every instance above enumerated, of the advantages of studying the Greek language, has been such as results from a due appreciation of the literature and general spirit of the language, an appreciation possible only for him who has already become its master. On the advantages which may accrue to him who, having started, halts before the goal is reached, *i.e.*, the advantages which accrue from the mere process of mastering the language, no stress has been laid. That there are such cannot be doubted, but they are altogether disproportionate to the amount of time and energy expended in their acquisition. Less time and energy devoted to other studies would yield equal or greater results. Our one justification for studying Greek is that certain solid, undeniable advantages attend upon its complete mastery. But the methods of teaching at present in vogue never, or scarcely ever, lead to that complete mastery. In the few instances where they do, it may be said that better methods would have attained the same results in a mere fraction of the time. The generality even of those who are reputed Greek scholars do not actually read and understand Greek. They read or glance at a Greek text, then frame English sentences corresponding to the Greek, and through these English sentences they obtain the meaning required. The Greek words and the Greek sentences do not call up immediately the corresponding ideas, but only mediately through a mental translation. In this way the literary effect is lost, and such a scholar has received, in return for his time and

trouble, but the advantages incident to the learning process itself, which is rightly held to be but inconsiderable as compared with energy expended. The method which the writer wishes now to present is one which aims at avoiding this defect and at the same time securing the maximum of benefit in connection with the learning process itself. He may add that the method embodies the result of his own experience with three classes under somewhat unique conditions, and with the exception of two or three modifications, which have been but lately incorporated in his method, has been put to the test of actual experience.

In teaching the alphabet the teacher should first enunciate a Greek sentence to his class, pronouncing slowly and distinctly and pausing at the end of each word. This should be repeated several times until the pupils become familiar with the different sounds involved. The written Greek sentence should then be placed for the first time before the eyes of the class; the teacher should then pronounce as before, the class pronouncing each word after him and examining with the eyes the printed characters. When the sentence has been read in this way, the class should be invited to associate, in as many cases as possible, sounds which they have heard, with printed characters in the text before them. One pupil, for example, may notice that the words γράφω and λέγει have one common sound, and one common character. The natural inference is that the common sound is represented by the common character: and in this way the proper sound is assigned to the letter γ. Another pupil may notice that the words γε and γῆ have the already discovered letter, together with another character which must in each case represent the remaining sound of the word. In this way proper sound values are assigned to ε and η. After as many characters in the sentence have had their sound values attached to them as a proper application of the method permits the different letters, so discovered, should be written upon the board and the pupils drilled in forming them. Other sentences should then be taken up, until all the characters employed in the language have their significance fully understood by the class.

This ability, thus acquired by the pupil, of assigning to each character its proper sound, must next be transformed into habit. This is effected by the pupils reading aloud under the direction of the teacher several pages of a Greek text, until familiarity with the characters is assured. The teacher should alternate these lessons by writing exercises, he reading slowly and distinctly a Greek sentence which the class reproduces in writing from the sound alone of the words as they fall from the teacher's lips, all

books being closed. At the end of each sentence the teacher will write the same upon the board, and the work of each pupil should be compared with that and mistakes corrected. After the pupils are able to use with ease the Greek characters, both for reading and writing purposes, the teacher should then formally present the alphabet to his class by writing the characters on the board in their customary order and assigning a name to each. The pupils should then be required to memorize the alphabet so presented, while the teacher may render them substantial assistance in the process by himself repeating aloud several times the names of the letters in the order given—thus, alpha, beta, gamma, delta, etc. Care should be taken to direct attention to the resemblance, which, in many cases, exists between a Greek letter and the corresponding Roman one: *e.g.*, *β* and b, *δ* and d, *γ* and g, and *ι* and i, *υ* and u *s* and s, and *τ* and t, and in other cases to the striking differences, as in *u* and n.

In presenting the alphabet after the above plan, the process is treated both as an end in itself and as a means to a further end, or rather as having both an immediate and a more remote object in view. In the former case it calls into play the discriminating and relating powers of the pupil's mind in no small degree. He first obtains an idea of a vague whole, he then subjects this to a rigid analysis and to a subsequent synthesis. The pupil's mental activity is aroused and directed in the proper psychological order. Presentation after the above plan has the further advantage of being intensely interesting. The writer has seen a class so absorbed in the above process of mastering the Greek alphabet that an involuntary sigh escaped its members when the ringing of a bell announced the end of the lesson period. In the initial and intermediate stages in connection with the learning of this language, although the view has been advanced that in themselves they confer no benefit commensurate with the expenditure of energy which they demand, still the utmost care in the development of the present method has been observed, in order to insure the greatest possible mental benefits which the actual learning process itself can bestow.

Following the acquisition of the alphabet, the pupils should have placed in their hands a Greek reading-book to serve as a basis for further instruction in the language. Primary instruction in Greek is handicapped by the fact that, so far, suitably-edited text-books for this stage have not appeared. The writer, however, may here be permitted to sketch his ideal. First as to matter contained: This should consist of short, easy and entertaining narra-

tive pieces. The first article might be the story of the Argonautic expedition, following this we might have the "Seven Against Thebes," in easy prose form, and a short account of the Trojan War. Interspersed there might be some of Æsop's fables, followed by short anecdotes of celebrated men, in which there should be especially portrayed the manners and customs of the two typical Greek communities, and the ordinary life of the Athenian and Spartan citizens. The text should be in a clear, bold type—the lines doubly spaced, and the short vowels (except ε and ο), carefully marked. The different stories should be arranged in short paragraphs, with English headings, and the entire work should be profusely illustrated, the illustrations aiming at presenting to the pupil's eyes the every-day environment of the ordinary Greek citizen, and especially emphasizing points of difference between Greek habits and customs and those of the modern world. While a good, general vocabulary would be necessary, no special vocabularies would be required; and all grammatical and explanatory notes might be advantageously omitted. It is essential that on the occasion of the pupil's first introduction to the actual study of the language, the principle of sense-realism should be, as far as possible, applied. Of course until our ideal primary book appears, we must use what material we have; possibly St. John's Gospel would be as suitable a text as may conveniently be obtained. And there are editions of the Greek New Testament which are issued in more attractive form than those of the Greek Classical authors. The method, of course, may be applied to any text, though care and attention exercised in this connection will be rewarded by correspondingly good results.

The text selected is now to be placed in the pupil's hands, and first the teacher and then the pupil reads aloud the paragraph in Greek. The first sentence is then read by the pupil, afterwards by the teacher, who now gives the English translation of the sentence as a whole, following it by a word-for-word translation in the order in which the Greek sentence appears. This word-for-word translation is repeated two or three times by the teacher, after which the pupil is invited to attempt the same. Some pupils succeed on the first attempt, others may hesitate at one or two words, but scarcely any will experience any real difficulty. The sentence, once understood, should be translated as above several times, and finally read as a whole and translated into a finished English sentence. Even in this the first simple step taken by the pupil in his introduction to the language, it will be noticed that the activities of the mind have been evoked in the natural

order: First, the vague synthesis, then the analysis, and lastly the explicit synthesis.

A variation of the above method, which the writer has not yet put to the test of actual experience, but which he believes might give better results especially in the primary stages, would be to make the first appeal entirely to the ear. All the work above described in dealing with a sentence might be done *viva voce* and the text book opened after the class can understand and translate the Greek words as they fall from the teacher's lips. The appeal to the eye, the reading, should follow immediately; and what has been understood through the ear, would then be apprehended by means of the eye. Such a plan, at least, would appear to copy nature; in the process of assimilating new material, there is no strain on the optic nerve, which, though it may appear trivial enough, is not without its influence in creating the feeling of effort in connection with knowledge acquisition; and this feeling, in young pupils at least, is a decided obstacle to the creation and maintenance of the interest feeling; in short, there would be nothing headachy about such a process; the pupil's attention would be constantly directed to the living teacher rather than to the dead book.

The second sentence should then be read in the Greek (or, if the *viva voce* method is adopted, enunciated by the teacher). The pupil should then be asked whether any of the new matter presented has already been met with in the previous sentence. Some of the commoner words are almost certain to be repeated from sentence to sentence, and the pupil will be likely to recognize such words as *καί*—and, *ἦν* (he) was, *ἦσαν* (they) were, *ἔφη* (he) said, etc. After all the repeated words have been recognized and meanings assigned to them, the new sentence should then be treated as the first sentence had been.

Each new sentence will now be examined carefully to find with what of its material the pupil is already acquainted. Before many sentences have been read, however, the pupil will meet with an experience or experiences of the following kind: He meets with a word, *e.g.* *ἀνθρωπος*, one form of which, *ἄνθρωπος* he has already seen. They would be the same word, were it not for the final letters, which in the one case is *ος* and in the other *ος*. After attending to these points of resemblance and difference, he is asked to observe whether there are corresponding points of similarity or dissimilarity in their respective meanings. He then notices that the two words have the same essential meaning; that they are nouns, but that *ἄνθρωπος* is used when the noun is in

the singular number and is the subject of a sentence, while ἀνθρώπων is used when the noun is plural and is translated by an English prepositional phrase introduced by "of." The essential meaning "man," he will then notice is contained in the part ἀνθρωπ. The pupil will now enter in a note book, which will be kept for the purpose, the following observation: "The ending ος, added to the stem of some nouns *may* denote that the noun is in the singular number and is the subject of a verb. The ending, ων may denote that the noun is plural and equivalent to an English prepositional phrase introduced by 'of.'" But in this connection he will notice another point. He recollects that he has met other nouns ending in ων, and translated by "of," *e.g.*, νησῶν, of islands, ὁδῶν of roads, etc. So his new knowledge may be strengthened by the results of his previous experience. He next notices that he has met several nouns having a common ending, *e.g.*, οις and that they all are plural and translated by an English prepositional phrase introduced by "to" or "for." He soon is warranted in drawing the general conclusion that all Greek nouns consist of two parts, one containing the meaning, and the other showing the noun's relation to the rest of the sentence. To the part containing the meaning the teacher now applies the term "stem," to the other, "case-ending."

In attempting new sentences the pupil is now called upon to identify, not only words which he has already met, but also endings, though the latter may be attached to unknown words. Since he is aware of the fact that all nouns contain endings, he is constantly alert to discover new instances of the latter; and soon his note-book contains by far the greater number. It is astonishing how soon a pupil in the process of reading a Greek text meets with all the ordinary endings of Greek nouns. In the writer's own experience, he has noticed that his class after not more than its *first* page of reading matter had been covered, came across *entire* sentences, which they could translate without difficulty at sight, as *every word* and *every ending* had already been met. An experience of this kind is a grand stimulus to a class and encourages them wonderfully with regard to the future. When this stage has been reached, the different endings already collected may be classified by the pupils, with approximately the following result:

Endings Denoting.	Singular Number.	Dual Number.	Plural Number.
1. Subject of sentence	ᾱ ᾰ ῆς ᾱς ης ᾰς Also some nouns have same form as 2d.	α ω ε	αι οι ες α
2. Phrase introduced by "of" (denoting generally possession)	ης ου ως	αιν οιν	ων
3. Phrase introduced by "to" or "for" (denoting generally advantage or disadvantage)	ῃ ῳ ι	αιν οιν	αις οις σι
4. Object of verb	ην αν ον ἀ	α ω ε	ας ους ους α
5. The subject addressed	ᾱ ᾰ ης ε ᾰς Also same form as 1st.	α ω ε	

He will now notice that the same ending may be ambiguous, *e.g.*, sometimes denoting the nominative and sometimes the genitive: though the context will, in almost every instance, leave little room for doubt as to which case is indicated. Further experience will teach him that a particular noun never takes more than one ending for any particular case, *e.g.*, that the noun stem ανθρωπ always has the ending ος to indicate that it is the subject of the verb, and singular in number; never η or α. Secondly, that nouns which take the same ending in one connection, do not differ from one another in any endings, *i.e.*, under the same circumstances they will all add the same endings. In this way he will form three great groups of nouns, divided into certain sub-groups, the nouns in any particular sub-group all using, under the same circumstances, the same endings. Since the facts are now known to him, the terms ordinarily attached to the different facts may now be given him; *i.e.*, when a noun is the subject of a sentence, it is said to be in the nominative case; when the object of a sentence, in the accusative case; when corresponding to an English prepositional phrase introduced by "to" or "for," it is said to be in the dative case; when answering to the English nominative of address, it is said to be in the vocative case. He may also be told that the process of adding the different case-endings to any noun stem is called "declining the noun," and that each of the three great groups which comprise all nouns is known to grammarians as a "declension."

In the manner above described, the pupil has now constructed the etymology of the noun for himself, by the natural process of proceeding from the particular to the general; and what he has acquired is the result of his own experience; he has actually

used the different case-endings before he has classified or named them. His power of understanding the use of the different case-endings does not depend upon the paradigms which he has formed, but those very paradigms are the result of his previous understanding. The case-ending in a noun appeals to him instinctively, if this term may be here used, as soon as it is met. On the other hand, the pupil drilled after the ordinary method, who first learns his paradigms, and then seeks to apply them, rarely, if ever, even after years of study, realizes the functions of the different endings. Deductive reasoning is very difficult of application, unless the general proposition is the result of a previous process of inductive reasoning on the part of the subject himself. It may be added that in acquiring the above-mentioned knowledge, the pupil has become acquainted with a large number of Greek words and with the general structure of the Greek sentence.

But concurrently with the acquiring of knowledge with respect to the noun, the pupil has also learned the main facts connected with the other parts of speech. Now certain Greek verbs are of very common occurrence, and the pupil will not have proceeded far before he will meet with such forms as *γίγνεται* (he) becomes, *γίγνονται* (they) become, *ἐγίγνετο*, (he) was becoming, *ἐγένετο*, (he) became, *ἐγένοντο*, (they) became. Now here he will note the subject and certain endings of the verb, *ται* and *το*, implying a subject in the singular; *νται* and *ντο*, a subject in the plural. Again, that the endings *νται* and *ται* are used (in this connection) in a present tense, and *το* and *ντο*, in past tenses. That in the past tenses also, the letter *ε* is prefixed to the stem. That the four forms given first are formed from the same stem, *γιγν*; that the two last observed forms are built upon the stem *γεν*, which though it resembles *γιγν* is not closely connected with it in form. The same ending, and also a stem-variation, he will notice in connection with other verbs. The writer has found, so far as his own experience is concerned, that the teaching of the Greek verb by the inductive method is much easier than is the teaching of the Greek noun, for the simple reason that the Greek verb has many points in common with the English verb. The Greek noun has scarcely any points in common with the English noun. The Greek noun is inflected, the English noun is not. The Greek verb is inflected, and so (though not so richly) is the English verb. The English noun has no cases (practically, that is), while the Greek noun is rich in this respect. The Greek verb and the

English verb have the same number of tenses and the same number or moods; and, with but one exception, the terms used are the same. So the already acquired knowledge of the pupil may be utilized much more extensively in teaching the verb than in teaching the noun. The following general and immediate results are to be aimed at: First. The different endings and stem-vowels should be carefully dissociated from the stem, and the latter conceived as being a stem peculiar to a certain tense, *i.e.*, that γεγον, for example, is a perfect stem, and whenever found, will indicate, amongst other things, the perfect tense. No reference should be made to the present stem, γιγν, until it is actually met in a sentence connection, when it should be treated by itself as a present stem, and compared as to its meaning with the already-met perfect stem, γεγον. Now the irregularities of Greek verbs are almost solely connected with their stem-formation; and the difficulty, in this regard, is entirely connected with the prevalent method of studying the language. The verb γίγνομαι is given; and with this the pupil is required by sheer force of memory to associate other forms which are not related to one another according to one general plan, and which he may have not yet met. He is, *inter alia*, required to learn the following string of words: γίγνομαι, γενήσομαι, ἐγενόμην, γέγονα; also, ὁράω (I see), ὄψομαι, εἶδον, ἑώρακα, not closely connected, in many cases not connected at all so far as stem formation is concerned. This is a very serious difficulty in connection with learning the Greek verb, and is one introduced by the grammarians, and entirely unnecessary. By treating each tense-stem as a separate word, the difficulty entirely disappears. The composite structure of the English verb makes this peculiarity of the Greek verb seem natural enough to the English pupil (cf. the different tenses of go, went, gone; owe, ought). With respect to mood, the pupil will notice that the indicative (with one or two exceptions) is indicated by a short vowel immediately attached to the stem, ο or ε; the subjunctive by a long vowel ω or η; the optative by the diphthongs, οι or αι; the imperative mood by peculiar personal endings; the infinitive by the tense signs, νι, σαι, σθαι, the active participle by the sign, ντ, and the middle participle by the sign μεν. That the differences in person, number, and voice are indicated by peculiar endings, with short forms, practice very soon familiarizes him.

Since the case of the noun has been treated at considerable length, it has not been thought necessary to more than indicate the different stages in the pupil's progress towards acquiring the knowledge of the verb outlined in the preceding paragraph. A more detailed understanding of the process may be readily gathered from what has been said with regard to the noun. It may be added that a form which is absolutely irregular, *i.e.*, not formed after a general plan, should be treated as *sui generis*, and an absolute meaning assigned to it, just as would be the case with an uninflected part of speech, *e.g.*, ἦν, means "was," ἔστι, "is," ἰέναι, "to go." The three irregular tenses of verbs in μι might advantageously be treated in the same way, *e.g.*, ἐδίδου = (he) was giving; ἔδοσαν = (they) gave; ἔβη = (he) went; ἔγνω = (he) perceived. (The second aorists of βαίνω and γιγνώσκω are μι formations.) While μι forms are often met, they are few in absolute number, *i.e.*, the same forms constantly recur, so that the pupil soon becomes familiar enough with the comparatively few verbs of each type. The cases of the adjective and of the adverb are simple enough. The former are declined like nouns, the only new feature which they present being the fact of their agreement with nouns. The comparison of the adjective and adverb are readily indicated by the suffixes of comparison, τερ, τατ, etc., and both this and the agreement of the adjective and the noun are very soon learned by practice. Of course the few phenomena presented in connection therewith should be carefully tabulated; but after what has been already said, both the manner of tabulating and the general result must be quite obvious.

Now with regard to the above method, it may be urged that it develops the pupil's mental activity along natural lines. He proceeds from the particular to the general, his discriminating and relating activity is being constantly utilized. He is on the watch for cases of resemblance and difference. He reasons both inductively and deductively, but the inductive process constantly precedes and forms the basis for the deductive. Again, the most constantly recurring words in any language are likewise the most irregularly formed words in that language. In fact their constant recurrence is the direct cause of their irregularity. The pitcher which goes often to the well is finally broken. The word which is in everybody's mouth loses in time its resemblance to its original form. With these which, when presented according to the prevalent deductive method, are the hardest to learn, the pupil soon becomes familiar, as he meets them constantly in actual use.

Again, some noun and verb forms are met with very often, others scarcely ever occur; but when these are learned formally, in paradigm fashion, equal attention is given to the frequently occurring and to the exceptional forms; while by learning them according to the above method, the degree of attention bestowed upon different inflectional forms is in exact proportion to the frequency of their occurrence.

The difficulty, which most pupils experience in passing from the short sentences of the primer to the involved sentences of continued prose narration is very marked—so marked, indeed, that a year's drill in translating and writing short sentences seems to afford no help whatever when the pupils come to deal with continued narrative. The writer has noticed instances of pupils who, previous to reading continued narrative, had studied nothing but paradigms and formal grammar, make as good progress in reading continued narrative as others who had spent the immediately preceding year in dealing with short sentences. This is perhaps due to the fact that the tendency of the classical language is toward the complex sentence; and the difference between a complex sentence and a simple sentence is so great that an exclusive training in the latter rather unfits a person for dealing with the former. By proceeding according to the method above outlined, the pupil's energies would be directed from the first to dealing with sentences such as the Greeks actually used.

Again, from the very first, the pupil actually uses the Greek language for the purposes for which languages are used, to convey connected ideas; the method approximates as closely as possible to nature's own. From the first he experiences the beauties of Greek literature, and must be influenced in a constantly increasing degree by the Greek spirit. The method is consequently an interesting one from the start; the dry abstractions of formal grammar are absent (the absurdity of teaching grammar before language should be apparent to every thinking man). The difficult paradigms and formidable lists of exceptions which are so depressing to the student as ordinarily instructed, are, according to the method above outlined, learned without the pupil's being aware of the process. Life and interest will now characterize a study, which is so generally regarded as dead and lifeless.

The necessity, which is obvious at this stage, of treating his [illegible] logically, has compelled the writer to neglect chronological [illegible]. We shall now revert to that stage in the pupil's [illegible] when he has sufficiently mastered the first paragraph

presented to him, so as to be able to translate it fluently into English. He should now commit his English translation to writing, close his Greek text-book, and re-translate, as best he can, his English translation into Greek. After he has accomplished this to the best of his ability, he should compare his own effort with the Greek text, carefully noting cases of disagreement. Then, putting aside the Greek, he should translate from the English again, comparing the result with the text as before. This process should be repeated until the English translation can be rendered into Greek without difficulty. The process tends to render the pupil an adept in the actual use of the language, and fixes his vocabulary.

The above method of re-translation is not an entirely new one. It was employed by Sturm in his celebrated school at Strasburg in connection with the teaching of Latin, the author used by him for the purpose being Cicero. The process sounds much more formidable than it actually is. The writer first experimented after this manner upon himself, re-translating in the above way large portions of Thucydides. At the very first the process was somewhat slow, but facility was very soon attained. After two or three days' practice, a half-page of Thucydides could be reproduced from an English translation, into the exact words of the original, as the result of fifteen or twenty minutes' practice. The good effects were not confined to the subject-matter of the author read, but also enabled the writer to translate from ordinary English prose into Greek with greatly decreased mental effort. For the last Senior Leaving examination a candidate was prepared by the writer who had taken Greek for but fourteen months in all. For the three months preceding the examination she was drilled in writing continued Greek prose in the manner above outlined, re-translating about three pages of Lysias a week. No original work in prose (continued) was assigned her. But at the examination, she rendered the English passage assigned for translation into Greek in about ten minutes. As she failed in Physics, her marks were forwarded her, and in Greek prose she obtained ninety-four per cent. The first time the William Dale scholarship was awarded (although by reversion) it was won by a candidate prepared by the writer, whose entire training in continued Greek prose was obtained in the above way.

The above facts are mentioned merely to show that the writer's estimate of the value of his method does not rest altogether on theoretical grounds. The imputation of lack of taste, which he may incur, is risked to emphasize the fact that the method has

been put to the test of practical experience, as the facts, which are mentioned, can be easily verified. Of course, a written examination may not be regarded as a trustworthy test of scholarship. A distinction may here be drawn between two distinct classes of intellectual work, one of which may, and the other of which may not, be tested by written examinations. To the first belong prescribed authors in any language, periods of history, or whatever admits of hasty memorization without evidencing real mental acquisition. To the second class belongs such work as does evidence such mental acquisition, in connection with which no process of hasty memorization may enable a candidate to present the appearance of knowledge without the reality, but to reproduce which evidences mental power over, and grasp of, the subject. Such would be translation at sight, and the writing of prose, the material not being drawn from a prescribed text, or a specially prepared vocabulary. To the latter class, consequently, belong the two test cases of which mention has just been made.

"But," it may be asked, "why write prose at all? Why should we not rather be content with understanding the Greek original without going to the altogether unnecessary trouble of composing in that language?" The answer is that if we could understand any language without composing in it, then the latter is purely unnecessary trouble, at any rate in the case of a language which we wish to use for literary purposes only. But the one process is impossible without the other. No man can understand fully a language which he is unable to use. Action and reaction are here, as elsewhere, equal, and we compose in Greek in order that we may better understand the thoughts already expressed in Greek. But composition should always follow what has been already learned. We should never use a word or construction which we have not already seen or heard in a sentence connection. We do not do so in the case of our native language. We hear before we speak. The common practice of putting into a pupil's hands a special work on prose-composition, containing set rules and special vocabularies of words, many of which he has never before seen, and expecting him to compose artificial sentences illustrating the grammatical and rhetorical rules arbitrarily given, is, of course, unspeakably vicious.

Now the above process of mastering the different paragraphs must, after a time, be discontinued, at least in some particulars. After, say, some fifteen or twenty pages have been mastered in this manner, the teacher's translating of the different sentences and his suggesting to the pupil the new words and new construc-

tions, should cease. The pupil should by this time be well acquainted with the general characteristics of a Greek sentence, with all those constantly recurring and irregularly formed words which form the majority of words in most sentences, and which under an artificial system are the hardest to teach, and under a natural system, the easiest to learn; and also with such a *copia verborum* that from sixty to a hundred per cent. of the words found in any new sentence will be words with which he is already acquainted. Thus equipped the pupil must enter upon another stage of his progress, in which he will be expected to construct, by his own mental activity, acting upon material, partly familiar, partly strange, the meanings of the different sentences and paragraphs. This process the writer considers of such importance that he hopes it will justify some prefatory remarks, which he here wishes to insert before describing his method in full.

The study of a Greek text, if properly pursued, constitutes a mental exercise of the highest and most beneficial kind, but as the finest instruments are the ones most easily spoiled, so, improperly pursued, this study may not only lose its beneficial properties, but as the viciousness of the method increases, it is capable of becoming positively injurious. The dull working out of the meaning of a text by applying to a vocabulary for every unknown word, and to copious notes for the solution of every grammatical difficulty, involving, as such a process does, no intellectual activity, but merely a plodding application, so far from arousing and developing mental power actually acts as a sedative for any already awakened. The student has before him a certain text; his object should be to master the meaning of that text, and to express that meaning in his mother tongue without any aid except that of his own reasoning powers, which, by rendering that aid, develop their own strength and power; in other words, for the learner it is not the knowledge of the meaning of a certain text, but the way in which that knowledge is attained, that is important.

Now, as to the method, the student should carefully read, in the original, the selected portion of the text, endeavoring, as he reads, to obtain as accurate an idea as possible of the different words and clauses. Next, he should take the passage, sentence by sentence, working out the meaning of each sentence and of each clause by itself. Now, in studying a particular sentence, the student is already in possession of certain facts with regard to it, and by means of these he is to obtain a knowledge of the unknown facts. Now, we might classify the facts necessary to a proper understanding of the meaning of a sentence into: 1. Things known.

These are (*a*) the meaning of certain stems, (*b*) the meaning of *a l* the endings, *i.e.*, the grammatical structure of the s n ence is already understood. 2. Things unknown—the meaning of certain stems. Now the meaning of these latter we must ascertain (*a*) by comparison with known Greek words, *e.g.*, in στρατοπεδον if the learner has already seen στρατος and πέδιον, he ought to have a fair idea of the word's meaning, and if he sees ἡγεμών, "a leader," for the first time, and has already seen ἡγέομαι, "I lead," the meaning of the first word should be evident to him; (*b*) by a comparison with English words, *e.g.*, with στρατηγια, "generalships" compare the English word "strategy"; (*c*) by the context, what *must* the word mean? *E.g.*, in the sentence, πρῶτος δέ Κλέαρχος τοὺς αὑτοῦ στρατιώτας ἐβιάζετο ἰέναι, the grammatical structure is here very apparent. Now suppose that we have an unknown word, ἐβιάζετο, which we know to be a verb. We now have the rest of the sentence which would read thus, "And Clearchus first of all . . . his own soldiers to proceed," leaving the verb, the word of action, untranslated. Now to this word we must assign a meaning in the light of the context. First, we gather all the facts which might bear upon the meaning of the word. It is in the imperfect tense, denoting an action begun, attempted, or extending over a period of time in the past. It is in the middle voice, in all probability indicating that the action was for the advantage of the actor. Now as to the circumstances. The Greek soldiers were very unwilling to proceed farther. Cyrus and their generals, on the contrary, were anxious for them to advance. We know the character of Clearchus, the first of the Greek generals, a man of stern, uncompromising temper, and accustomed to being obeyed. So in the light of the context we are almost certain to arrive at the meaning of the verb, "was for forcing," "tried to force." The student must compel himself, after carefully examining the facts and the circumstances in connection with the sentence, to assign to each word its most probable meaning, no matter how difficult that may in some cases appear. The other sentences in the extract should then be treated in the same way, and possibly the interpretation of a subsequent sentence may throw additional light upon a preceding one. The entire passage should be studied in this manner until the student has formed for himself a full idea of its meaning and expressed that meaning in his mother tongue. Then, but not before, the dictionary may be consulted with regard to the doubtful words; and

in case the student has been mistaken in the interpretation of any of them, he should endeavour to detect that error in the reasoning process which led him to assign an incorrect meaning to the word in question.

After the meaning of the passage has been carefully worked out in the above way, the student should then proceed to master the passage in the original, *i.e.*, to know what the words and sentences mean *in Greek*. In the great majority of cases, we do not try to read Greek or Latin, but we merely give an English equivalent for each Greek or Latin word, and then grasp the idea through the meaning of the English word; so the Greek or Latin text is in such cases merely a cryptograph, which must be deciphered before we can arrive at its meaning, and so the literary effect of the language is altogether lost. The sum total of the meanings of the different words by no means expresses the meaning of the passage. But, as has already been shown, there is an added effect produced by the choice and combination of words which constitutes literary and artistic effect, and this is almost altogether lost in translation. So the student should carefully read over in the Greek the passage which he has worked out, forcing upon himself a mental image of the idea represented by each word and by each clause, resolutely refusing to receive that image through the medium of an English word; *e.g.*, in reading the Greek word *γέφυρα* he should force upon his mental vision the actual picture of a *bridge*, not, as is almost universally the case, see before him or pronounce the English word "bridge," and through that word grasp the idea. Each word in a sentence, and finally the sentence as a whole, should be associated at first hand with each word-meaning and with the full sentence-meaning. The passage should be read and re-read until the reading produces without effort, and without the necessity of even a mental translation into another tongue, a full understanding of the passage.

Advantages of the method: First, it stimulates mental activity and so promotes interest; the student feels that the results produced are his own and that he is not merely a passive receptacle into which facts may be poured. If properly understood and intelligently applied, it differs as much, from the point of view of interest alone, from the dictionary and grammar method as a game of chess does from the task of memorizing a string of historical dates. Secondly, it is not guesswork, but involves reasoning of the highest possible kind. Mathematical reasoning is very largely after the following model: A = B, B = C, therefore A = C. But in being told that A = B and B = C, we have also

been told that A = C. In mathematics the quaesita are already contained in the data. A mathematical problem in which such is not the case would be impossible of solution. But in mastering intelligently a Greek or Latin text, all the data are not given; the student is required to construct by his own reasoning powers the data which are wanting. The question of probability enters constantly into his reasoning, and this is the very kind of mental training that the student emphatically needs. In the life problems which he will have to solve, the data are only given in part, not wholly, as in mathematics; and the reasoning required is the very kind which the proper study of Greek tends to develop.

Again, as to vocabulary, if the student develops the meaning of a word for himself, he will be unlikely to forget it, and even should he assign to a word the wrong meaning, the principle of contrast will tend as strongly to keep the true meaning in his mind, after such meaning has been learned from the dictionary, especially if he endeavors to detect some error in his chain of reasoning. And the subsequent reading and understanding of the passage in the Greek will also tend to indelibly impress the meaning of a word upon his mind; especially as he has learned it in its connection with other words, for no word has a stereotyped meaning, but one that is influenced by the proximity of other words and by its own position in the sentence.

Lastly, as to its practicability, of course a working vocabulary of several hundred words is a useful antecedent to the proper application of the method, a vocabulary which the student is already supposed to have mastered in the preceding exercises; but with such a vocabulary and the necessary grammatical preparation, there are very few, if any, sentences in either Greek or Latin, of which a moderately intelligent pupil cannot prepare for himself a fair translation. The process may be at first a long and somewhat difficult one, but both the length and the difficulty will be found to decrease in geometrical progression, if constant practice is maintained. It is the natural method of language study. Of how many English words have we obtained the meaning from the dictionary, or from having been directly told it by others? The meaning of the words of any language can be obtained as that of the words of our mother-tongue has been obtained, viz. by a study of the circumstances under which they are used. And again, it is only in this way, by depending on himself and dispensing with extraneous aid, that the student can obtain a thorough mastery of the Greek language. The [illegible] only too common, of a student struggling for nine or

ten years with the language, and then being unable to understand without dictionary aid an unseen passage of a Greek or Latin author, is a standing commentary on the uselessness of the ordinary methods.

Now, with reference to our pupil's course in Greek literature, the proper arrangement and gradation of authors is of eminent importance. We should be guided also by the fact that the literature of the language naturally divides itself into six parts, three being comprehended in the prose and three in the poetry of the language. These divisions may be tabulated as follows:

Prose.		*Poetry.*
1. Narrative.	Corresponding to	1. Epic.
2. Oratorical	" "	2. Dramatic.
3. Philosophical.	" "	3. Lyric.

The above differ amongst themselves with regard to both style and vocabulary, and we should regard it as essential that our pupil should become a thorough master of one of the above divisions before proceeding to one higher, that he should be able to read and write prose at sight before attempting poetry. His first attempt should be in connection with narrative prose. The writer here takes the opportunity of registering his protest against the practice followed in English-speaking countries of reading short excerpts from certain books, and then proceeding to deal with matter entirely different, taking, for example, the second book of the Anabasis, and then the fourth book of the Iliad. The reader does not master the style of one author before being hurried into the midst of some work of another author, whose style and vocabulary may be widely different from the author last studied. The result is to draw the pupil's attention entirely away from the matter and concentrate it entirely upon the form, a proceeding which paralyzes interest, and therefore prevents proper mastery of the form itself. Attention should be concentrated fully upon the matter, the form is then unconsciously and without effort acquired. The pupil should first thoroughly master narrative prose. Each book read by him should be read in its entirety; he should begin at the beginning and continue to the end. Nay, it is even desirable that he confine his attention to one author until he has read all his works. Each author has a style peculiar to himself, and you might also say a substyle peculiar to each particular work. Now in reading a book written in a foreign tongue, the chief difficulty for one who is moder-

ately familiar with the language is to master each author's substyle and style. This done, the rest is easy, and the more he reads *continuously* of his author the greater becomes his mastery of style. Interruption, however, the proceeding from one author to another, destroys this continuity and hinders progress. Under our system of proceeding by short excerpts, no author's style, not even the substyle of any particular book, is ever, even dimly, understood, to say nothing of being mastered; so this point of greatest difficulty is being continually presented to Greek students, who must shape their reading by the curricula in force in English-speaking countries.

The pupil, then, should confine his attention at first to narrative prose, to one author, and to one book at a time. Now, after the pupil has read his introductory reading-book, which by this time has served its purpose, he might with profit be introduced to Xenophon, both because the works of this author are comparatively easy reading and also because he has composed treatises which belong to the oratorical and philosophical divisions, as well as to that of pure narrative. His narrative works might now be read in the following order: (1) De Re Equestri (*ιππικὸς*), an interesting treatise on the horse and horsemanship; (2) The Cynegeticus (*κυνηγετικος*), a fascinating treatise on hunting; (3) The Cyropaedia; (4) The Anabasis; (5) The Hellenica. The above works are arranged in the order of familiarity which the English reader may be presumed to have with the subject matter of each. The Hellenica is put last, as it is written in a decidedly less interesting style than are the others mentioned. After reading the works of Xenophon, Thucydides should then be attempted, and his History of the Peloponnesian War read from beginning to end. Then a new departure should be made, and the entertaining narratives of Herodotus placed before the reader. Here attention should be directed to the dialectic peculiarities of Herodotus, and great light will now be thrown upon the earlier forms of the Greek language, and the reader will notice that many of the forms with which he has become familiar have been derived from earlier ones by the process of contracting a final vowel of a stem with the initial vowel of an ending. In Herodotus also there should be no piecemeal work, but the whole of his charmingly interesting history should be read. Plutarch's "Lives" might next be read, as an example of later Greek, and also of the way in which the Greek spirit was affected by the Roman conquest. The course in narrative prose might then be concluded by the reading of the New Testa-

ment in the original, as an example of what is known as Hellenistic Greek, *i.e.*, of Greek as used by the millions of the Eastern Empire who were barbarians by birth, but who used Greek for literary and commercial purposes.

The above would constitute a fairly thorough course in narrative Greek prose. If studied after the manner outlined, it would ensure that the student should become thoroughly at home in this department of the Greek language; it will now be time for him to attempt oratorical and afterwards philosophical Greek prose. It is unnecessary for the writer to outline a list of authors to be read in these two departments, or in the different divisions of poetical literature; the pupil has now become so thoroughly at home with regard to the language, and so imbued with the spirit of the method employed, that he may be safely left to make his own selections. A few words of advice might here be tendered, however. As Xenophon's narrative prose introduced us to that division of Greek literature, so, since with his style we are already familiar, his oratorical work and philosophical works might form our introduction to those departments of literature respectively. As an introduction to philosophical prose (using the term in its broadest sense—relating to the science of man) we might read the works of Xenophon in the following order: (1) The Œconomicus, relating to the administration of a household; (2) The Hiero (*ἱέρων ἢ Τυραννικός*); (3) The Respublica Lacedæmoniorum and Respublica Atheniensium (*Λ. πολιτεία* and (*Α. πολιτεία*); (4) The De Vectigalibus (*περι προσόδων*); (5) The Symposium, or Banquet of Philosophers); (6) The Memorabilia of Socrates, in four books. The first four of the above relate to household, or to political economy, the last two to ethics. In connection with oratorical prose, Demosthenes should hold the same place that Thucydides does in narrative prose, while Lysias, for obvious reasons, would correspond to Plutarch. In epic poetry, the Iliad and Odyssey of Homer might constitute the entire course.

Now the above may appear to comprise a very formidable curriculum, and if taken according to the piecemeal plan—one book of Xenophon, then a book of Homer, then a few chapters of Thucydides, then an oration of Demosthenes—could not be covered in an ordinary lifetime. Followed in the manner which has been indicated, however, it should be covered in a comparatively short time. After the Xenophon has been read, the Thucydides and Herodotus should, after the initial difficulty with regard to style has been overcome, be read with almost as much ease and rapidity

as one would read a book written in his vernacular. Practically all the words will have been met, either in simple or compound form, and occasional new words will be readily understood from the context; and the pupil will be so familiar with the process of sight reading, that his subsequent course should afford him nothing but pleasure.

Now, except in respect to narrative prose, the above course might be varied to suit individual tastes. If a person should decide that a thorough knowledge of Greek narrative prose should mark the limit of his progress in Greek, he might now turn his attention away from this particular department of knowledge, feeling that he has made a permanent acquisition: that he has the power of reading and understanding with ease any Greek narrative author. He has imbibed, to a certain extent, the spirit of Greek literature, and can describe definitely to himself and to others the amount and character of the progress that he has made in the Greek tongue. Another may have no desire to have a specialist's knowledge of the language, but merely a broad, general culture in the same. He may choose to omit some departments of its literature in which he takes no pleasure, but may apply himself to one or two departments, say, to Epic or Lyric poetry, or both, while a third may desire to read one or two authors in each of the departments. All should, however, have the thorough preliminary grounding in narrative prose, and whatever subsequent reading they may do, they should not deviate from the practice of reading an entire work of one author at a time. The one who desires, however, to be a specialist in Greek, will save time and trouble by following the plan outlined.

The great humanist of the Middle Ages, Erasmus, was the one who first drew attention to the advisability of arranging the classical authors, to be studied in an ascending order of difficulty. And one great cause of controversy between the Jesuits and the Port Royalists was with regard to the very question of excerpts *versus* entire authors. The Jesuits were concerned with form only. They aimed at producing fluent speakers and not deep thinkers. The Port Royalists aimed at training both intellect and heart, and considered matter as more important than form. Consequently the Jesuits read short extracts from different Latin authors. The Port Royalists read entire authors. The different ends in view are well indicated by the different means employed.

Now, with regard to formal grammar, little has been said. The writer, however, would not be regarded as advocating the aboli-

tion of grammatical studies, merely their postponement until the pupil has made a reasonable acquaintance with the language itself. It might be here remarked that attention to the facts of grammar, other than the few points which have already been dwelt upon, is not necessary either to the understanding of a language nor to the appreciation of its literature. Knowledge of grammar is not a necessary antecedent to the knowledge of any tongue. Which was evolved first in the order of Nature, the language or the grammarian? In fact, the best linguists are those who have mastered a language without reference to its grammar. But, of course, the Greek specialist will wish to understand the language both from a literary and scientific standpoint. Such a one, having mastered the language, may then be introduced to the study of its grammar. The scientific analysis of an already-mastered language is interesting and easy for the pupil, for he then recognizes facts with which he is already familiar, but properly analyzed and classified; and a few short weeks, or at the most months, suffices for an intelligent mastery of what, if presented out of its natural place, would require almost as many weary years to be even faintly and imperfectly understood. The study of formal grammar should not begin, until at least, the course in narrative prose, outlined above, has been completed.

With regard to prose it might be mentioned that the course in re-translation should not, after the first book has been read, be continued *pari passu* with subsequent reading. Certain portions, of course, should be selected for daily practice in prose composition; but the reading should become in time much too rapid to admit of written transcription into English, and then again into Greek. In time, passages from English authors should be selected for translation into Greek, and even original composition might profitably be attempted. It will be observed that all the composition hitherto mentioned has been in continued prose. No notice has been taken of the short sentence, which forms the staple for present-day composition. Of it mention will shortly be made.

The formal study of the Greek grammar, conducted, of course, for scientific and not utilitarian purposes, should proceed along the lines of inductive reasoning. By careful observation and analysis of the texts read, the student should form his own grammar, and the teacher should, by judicious guidance, endeavor to have the synthesized efforts of the student obtain the following general result: (*a*) A scientific analysis of the alpha-

bet, leading up to the general principles of contraction, elision, crasis, accentuation, etc.; (*b*) the noun. Here, throughout, careful attention should be bestowed upon the case endings as distinct from the stem. The final arrangement should be (the writer indicates the classes by certain nouns which may be taken as types of their respective classes): First declension, Class 1, *νική*; Class 2, *πεῖρα*; Class 3, *ποῦσα*. Second declension, Class 1, *ὁδός*; Class 2, *δῶρον*. Mixed first and second declensions, Class 1, *πολίτης*; Class 2, *νεανίας*. . Attic second declension, Class 1, *λέως*; Class 2, *ἀναγέων*. Third declension (here the classification should follow the general division of the alphabet), Class 1, mute stems; Sub-class 1, *κ* mute stems; Sub-class 2, *π* mute stems; Sub-class 3, *τ* mute stems; Sub-class 4, *ντ* stems; (*a*) preceded by *ο*, as *λέων*; (*b*) not preceded by *ο*, as *γιγας*; Sub-class 5, neuter nouns with stems ending in a *τ* mute; Class 2, Liquid stems; Class 3, *ς* stems; Sub-class 1, masculine or feminine nouns, as *τριήρης*; Sub class 2, neuter nouns, as *ὄρος*; Class 4, Vowel stem; Sub class 1, invariable vowel stems, as *ἰχθυς*; Sub-class 2, variable vowel stems, as *πόλις, ἄστυ*; Class 5, Diphthongal stems, as *βασιλεύς*. After the regular noun should follow contract nouns in the three declensions; and lastly irregular nouns. Next should follow the adjectives, classified as follows: 1. Adjectives of three terminations, first and second declensions. 2. Of two terminations, second declension. 3. Of three terminations, third declension. 4. Of two terminations, third declension. 5. Of three terminations, first and third declensions. 6. Contract adjectives. 7. Irregular adjectives. Then should follow the formation of adverbs from adjectives and the comparison of each. In connection with the verb, the aim should be to separate the verb into stem (varying with the tense), stem-vowel, and personal ending. Six distinct systems of personal endings should be distinguished, viz., primary, secondary and imperative in both active and middle voices. Then the contract verbs in the present and imperfect tenses should be presented. Then the verbs in *μι* (three tenses). After the verb, the pronoun (on account of its great irregularity) should be dealt with, and lastly the numerals, in each case dealing with regular forms first, irregularities and exceptions afterwards.

With regard to syntax, the following classification should be aimed at:

I. The Noun.

a. Nominative Case.

(1) The Word Noun. *b.* Genitive "
c. Accusative "
d. Dative "
e. Vocative "

(2) The Clause Noun.

A. Definite. *a.* The Indirect Statement.
b. " " Question.
c. " " Command.

B. Indefinite. (ἄν with subjunctive in primary, and optative without ἄν in secondary sequence.)

2. The Adjective.

(1) The Word Adjective. *a.* Agreement with noun.
b. The case of the adjective modifying two or more nouns.

(2) The Clause Adjective. *a.* Definite.
b. Indefinite.

3. The Verb.

(1) In a direct statement. *a.* Indicative mood.
b. Subjunctive "
c. Optative "

(2) In a direct question.
(3) In a direct command.
(4) The verbal adjective in τέος.
a. Personal construction.
b. Impersonal "

4. The Adverb.

(1) The word adverb.
(2) The phrase adverb.
(3) The clause adverb.
A. Definite.
a. Purpose Clause.
b. Result "
c. Time "
d. Conditional "

e. Concessive(?) (καίπερ with participle).
f. Cause.
g. Place.
h. Manner.
i. Degree.

B. Indefinite.

5. The Sub-Clause (*i.e.*, a clause in a second or further degree of subordination).
   a. In indirect narration.
   b. In other constructions.

6. Irregular Constructions.

The above is necessarily in the vaguest outline, and merely indicates the general plan to be followed. In connection with the syntax, as may be seen by the above very compressed classification, the method differs greatly from others. Any attempt in the present paper to deal with this portion of our subject would prolong the paper to an undue length. His method of dealing with Greek syntax the writer has elaborated in minute detail in a separate paper, which might conveniently form an appendix to the present thesis.

Each separate subdivision of the syntax should be followed by an exercise of short English sentences to be turned into Greek, these being introduced here for the first time. It will be noticed that by this, the ordinary arrangement of short sentences in the primary stage, followed by continued prose in a subsequent stage of the student's progress, is reversed. The short sentences, as before mentioned, afford no help to the student in the actual handling of the Greek text. Their place is accordingly here, where the grammar is studied for the value attached to the process of scientific classification. They are not regarded in this method as furthering the practical purpose of intelligently understanding the Greek language and appreciating its literature.

The method, which has now been outlined, the writer has spent some years in elaborating. The present paper is a compendium of a great number of notes which he has from time to time taken, partly the results of his teaching experience. So far as somewhat limited opportunities would allow, he has submitted his theories to the test of actual practice, with results which at any rate were satisfactory to himself. One objection, amongst many which may

possibly be urged, he hastens to anticipate, namely, that the method demands too much from the teacher, and could not be adopted except by a trained specialist. It is for such that the method has been outlined; nor is it too much to expect that a province, where the value of scientific pedagogy is recognized, will provide scientifically trained specialists in, at any rate, its larger centres. Finally it may be said that the method aims at arousing the self-activity of the pupil; at leading from the vaguely realized, through the careful examination of particulars, to the definitely understood. It aims, especially, at making the enjoyment of Greek literature possible for him who wishes such, without compelling him to pay, as its price, a lifetime of laborious toil.

The R. W. B. Jackson
Library
OISE

T T c2
Thompson # Methods in Greek. --
OISE
3 0005 01020517 0

T copy 2
T
Thompson
Methods in Greek

T copy 2
T
Thompson
Methods in Greek